



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/055,770	01/23/2002	Shigeo Fujimori	1023-02	8726
35811 7590 02/07/2007 IP GROUP OF DLA PIPER US LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE 1650 MARKET ST, SUITE 4900 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			EXAMINER LIN, JAMES	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1762	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/07/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

C

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/055,770	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FUJIMORI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jimmy Lin	<b>Art Unit</b> 1762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 12 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 12 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark (U.S. Patent 6,749,690) in view of Shigeo et al. (JP 2000-113978).

The rejection is stated in the Office Action filed 6/20/2006.

4. Claims 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark '690 in view of Shigeo '978 as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Yamada et al. (U.S. Publication 2001/0019807).

Clark and Shigeo are discussed above. Clark teaches the use of four masks (i.e.,  $m = 4$ ) but does not explicitly teach wherein  $m$  and  $k$  satisfy  $n = m \times k$  where  $k$  is a number of said array deposition apertures. However, Yamada teaches a method of making an EL device [0002], wherein a mask is used for deposition. The mask can have four arrays of deposition apertures (Fig. 9A). An array of deposition apertures "k" is interpreted to be a group of apertures separated by the thick portion 140. A device "n" is interpreted to be the array of pixels formed from an array of deposition apertures. The selection of something based on its known suitability for its intended use has been held to support a prima facie case of obviousness. Sinclair &

Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp., 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have formed four arrays of deposition apertures for each mask of Clark with a reasonable expectation of success because Yamada teaches that such a mask configuration is suitable in the art of EL deposition. In this case, both “k” and “m” is 4.

*Response to Arguments*

5. The Applicant notes that the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection over Clark ‘690 and Shigeo ‘978 addresses not only claim 11 but also claims 12 and 14. The Applicant is correct and the statement of rejection has been corrected to address this obvious typographical error.

6. Applicant's arguments filed 11/27/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claims 11-12 and 14 as rejected over Clark ‘690 and Shigeo ‘978:

The Applicant argues that the JP 2001-023474 priority application predates the earliest effective filing date of Clark and that the English translation provides full support for the subject matter of both claims 11 and 14. However, this argument is not persuasive because the JP ‘474 English translation does not support at least “using alignment marks formed on said integrated mask and said single substrate” because JP ‘474 does not provide a generic teaching of “using” such alignment marks (see, e.g., [0021], [0026]-[0027], and [0030]). For at least this reason, the rejection has been maintained. The Applicant is advised to specifically and clearly indicate where the support can be found for every limitation of claims 11 and 14.

Claim 13 as rejected over Clark ‘690, Shigeo ‘978, and Nagayama ‘055:

The Applicant's arguments regarding the number of arrays of deposition apertures “k” as explained in the specification are unconvincing. Claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim should not be read into the claim (see MPEP 2106.II.C.). Nevertheless, the rejection has been modified to address the newly added limitation of “where k is a number of

Art Unit: 1762

said array of deposition apertures formed on said each deposition mask". The interpretation of "k" is discussed above.

*Conclusion*


7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jimmy Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-8902. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Meeks can be reached on 571-272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
**KEITH HENDRICKS**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**